DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 946 UD 025 740

AUTHOR Orfield, Gary; And Others
TITLE School Segregation in the 1980's: Trends in the United States and Metropolitan Areas. A Report by the National School Desegregation Project.
SPONS AGENCY Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C.h
PUB DATE Jul 87
NOTE 56p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Asian Americans; *Blacks; Busing; *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Enrollment; Ethnic Distribution; *Hispanic Americans; Metropolitan Areas; Public Policy; Public Schools; *Racial Integration; Regional Characteristics; *School Desegregation

ABSTRACT

The segregation of blacks in American public schools has changed little since 1972. During the same period of time there has been a constant growth in the segregation of Hispanics in schools. No branch of the Federal Government has taken any policy initiatives toward desegregation since 1971. This report presents information concerning the status of minority enrollment in schools by state and by metropolitan area. The major findings are the following: (1) states with the greatest integration of blacks typically have extensive court orders requiring busing; (2) states in which blacks are most segregated have fragmented school districts within large metropolitan areas and nc city-suburban desegregation plan; (3) a few states experienced a modest reduction in segregation due to state government monitoring of desegregation; (4) the northeastern United States is the most segregated region; and (5) in locations where Hispanic populations are concentrated there are no widely implemented desegregation plans. Little data are available for the rapidly growing Asian population, but national statistics show that Asian students are typically attending well integrated schools with white majorities. Further examination of the accomplishments and the challenges of school desegregation is needed at the national level of policy making. (VM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

8121187

JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES

1301 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 400 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004 • 202-626-3500

ED285946

SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN THE 1980s

TRENDS IN THE UNITED STATES AND METROPOLITAN AREAS

TO THE JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES

by

GARY ORFIELD

WITH FRANKLIN MONFORT AND ROSEMARY GEORGE

JULY 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gary Orfield
Univ. of Chicago

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN THE 1980s

TRENDS IN THE UNITED STATES AND METROPOLITAN AREAS

TO THE JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL STUDIES

by

GARY ORFIELD

WITH FRANKLIN MONFORT AND ROSEMARY GEORGE

JULY 1987

SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN THE 1980s

Trends in the States and Metropolitan Areas

A Report by the National School Desegregation Project

to the Joint Center for Political Studies

Gary Orfield

with Franklin Monfort and Rosemary George

July 1987

There has been little overall change in the segregation of black students in American public schools in the 1980s. In fact there has been little change of national or regional importance since 1972. The last major expansion of school desegregation law took place sixteen years ago, when the Supreme Court handed down its decision about busing in the South. Since that time there has been a standoff in desegregation efforts. Three of the four Administrations since 1968 were openly hostile to urban desegregation orders and the Carter Administration took few initiatives in the field. There have been no important policy initiatives supporting desegregation from any branch of government since 1971. Advocates of further racial change have found themselves reduced to defensive positions devoting most of

their energy to an effort to prevent a rollback of what has already been achieved. In spite of many large battles over the segregation of black children in the courts and elsewhere, the regional and national statistics are virtually unchanged. When all the positive and negative forces are added together the aggregate statistics make it appear that nothing has happened.

The situation is very different for the Hispanics. Unlike the the record for blacks, the figures show a constant growth in the isolation of Hispanics, with segregation becoming increasingly severe in virtually all parts of the country and in almost every period in the sixteen years that national data has been collected. If changes in policy and national leadership in Washington seem almost irrelevant in explaining a continuing level of black segregation that persists no matter who is in power or what cases are decided, the growth of Hispanic segregation appears to occur just as autonomously.

While black segregation has remained about the same under Presidents Ford, Carter, and Reagan, Hispanic segregation has been growing steadily since the late 1960s when it was first measured nationally.

The national and regional totals, however, may obscure different kinds of state and local situations that are actually moving in opposite directions. The school desegregation statistics for fall 1984 show enormous variation in levels of segregation and in recent changes among the various states and metropolitan areas. By closely examining the state and

metropolitan trends it may be possible not only to provide important basic information for state and local policy makers and researchers but also to show the varied effect of local decisions that may have potential national importance in future choices in civil rights policy.

The states with the greatest integration of black students typically have extensive court orders requiring busing. Although they were by no means among the states with the smallest black enrollments, the most integrated states tend not to have the largest shares of black students.(see table 1). Delaware and Kentucky, which were the most integrated states with significant black populations, had 26% and 11% statewide black enrollments in 1984. Both of these states had one large metropolitan area where the courts forced city-suburban school integration during the 1970s. These court orders, virtually eliminating segregated education in the metropolitan Wilmington and Louisville areas, left the states with what was probably a higher level of integration than any state with a significant black population had ever experienced. In 1984, 91 percent of Kentucky black students and 94% of those in Delaware were in predominantly white schools and there had been no significant decline in the very high level of integration in the 1980s. (See Table 2)

The third most integrated state, Nevada, also had a metropolitan desegregation plan in its largest metropolitan area, Las Vegas. The plan covered the vast Clark Country school district and it produced a situation where five of every six

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF WHITE STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF A TYPICAL BLACK STUDENT, BY STATE, IN STATES WITH AT LEAST 5% BLACK STUDENTS

State	1984 Percentage Black Enrollment	Percent of White Students in the School of a Typical Black Student			Percentage Point Change
		1970	1980	1984	1970-1984
(Washington, D.C.)	92.5	2.2	1.5	1.7	- .5
Mississippi	50.4	29.6	29.2	29.9	.3
Louisiana	42.5	30.8	32.8	35.0	4.2
South Carolina	40.6	41.2	42.7	43.0	1.8
Maryland	37.2	30.3	35.4	26.6	- 3.7
Georgia	35.8	35.1	38.3	34.2	- .9
Alabama	34.5	32.7	39.7	38.0	5.3
North Carolina	30.0	49.0	54.0	52.6	3.6
Delaware	25.8	46.5	68.5	68.2	21.7
Arkansas	25.3	42.5	46.5	44.0	1.5
Illinois	24.8	14.6	19.0	16.5	1.9
Virginia	23.8	41.5	47.4	47.6	6.1
Florida	23.1	43.2	50.6	48.0	4.8
Tennessee	20.9	29.2	38.0	37.1	7.9
New Jersey	18.8	32.4	26.4	29.1	- 3.3
New York	18.7	29.2	23.0	20.6	- 8.6
Michigan	16.7	21.9	22.5	19.4	- 2.5
Missouri	16.2	21.4	34.1	31.5	10.1
Ohio	14.4	28.4	43.2	41.8	13.4
Texas	13.9	30.7	35.2	38.5	7.8
Pennsylvania	12.6	27.8	29.3	32.6	4.8
Indiana	10.7	31.1	38.7	49.4	18.3
Kentucky	10.6	49.4	74.3	72.1	22.7
Connecticut	10.3	44.1	40.3	40.1	- 4.0
California	10.1	25.6	27.7	29.3	3.7
Nevada	9.9	55.7	68.4	67.0	11.3
Oklahoma	9.9	42.1	57.6	55.6	13.5
Wisconsin	7.7	25.7	44.5	41.9	16.2
Kansas	6.8	51.6	59.1	61.7	10.1
Massachusetts	6.3	47.5	50.4	46.1	- 1.4
Rhode Island	5.5	*	65.8	62.8	
Colorado	5.1	*	54.2	53.3	

*not available

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF BLACK STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS MORE THAN 50% WHITE, BY STATE, BY DECLINING BLACK ENROLLMENT, 1984 FIGURES

State	Black Enrollment 1980	Black Enrollment 1984 (%)	Percentage of Black Students in Predominantly White Schools 1968	1980	1984	Percentage Point Change 1968-1984
New York	484,286	496,779 (18.7)	32.31	23.26	18.3	-14.01
California	400,657	445,829 (10.1)	22.49	24.67	25.2	2.71
Texas	408,747	445,189 (13.9)	25.25	36.01	42.0	16.75
Illinois	403,061	415,065 (24.8)	13.62	20.55	16.0	2.38
Florida	348,768	370,413 (23.1)	23.21	60.35	55.3	32.09
North Carolina	329,724	351,985 (30.0)	28.31	64.04	59.5	31.19
Georgia	359,888	333,689 (35.8)	14.03	39.89	33.5	19.47
Louisiana	322,985	324,282 (42.5)	8.89	34.21	33.5	24.61
Michigan	314,204	264,887 (16.7)	20.60	18.14	16.2	- 4.40
South Carolina	262,110	262,363 (40.6)	14.19	40.12	43.8	29.61
Pennsylvania	231,331	242,486 (12.6)	27.52	29.27	33.1	5.58
Ohio	249,485	241,876 (14.4)	27.74	41.14	36.8	9.06
Alabama	249,734	239,305 (34.5)	8.29	44.28	41.3	33.01
New Jersey	226,814	236,418 (18.8)	33.88	23.29	29.9	- 3.98
Virginia	257,657	218,591 (23.8)	26.90	42.27	48.5	21.60
Mississippi	228,251	194,624 (50.4)	6.71	23.56	27.1	20.39
Maryland	231,590	186,996 (37.2)	31.11	32.78	20.8	-10.31
Tennessee	204,014	180,713 (20.9)	21.25	36.73	39.0	17.75
Arkansas	92,227	120,673 (25.3)	22.61	42.17	38.5	15.89
Indiana	102,317	115,124 (10.7)	29.98	38.14	55.9	25.92
Missouri	113,357	108,630 (16.2)	24.56	36.35	30.5	5.94
Washington, D.C.	97,962	76,960 (92.5)	0.90	0.91	0.3	- .60
Kentucky	59,611	61,482 (10.6)	53.72	91.12	91.1	37.38
Connecticut	53,943	57,016 (10.3)	43.32	42.06	43.3	- .02
Oklahoma	48,173	55,014 (9.9)	37.81	65.71	61.6	23.79
Wisconsin	50,740	54,757 (7.7)	22.54	46.54	35.8	13.26
Massachusetts	56,675	48,407 (6.3)	51.24	43.99	41.4	- 9.84
Kansas	29,159	34,588 (6.8)	53.44	70.96	72.1	18.66
Washington	25,989	28,684 (3.8)	64.23	76.38	75.6	11.37
Delaware	24,900	25,290 (25.8)	54.23	95.14	94.2	39.97
Colorado	25,203	25,028 (5.1)	30.52	53.05	52.8	22.28
Nevada	*	14,930 (9.9)	*	*	85.7	
Rhode Island	6,642	8,174 (5.5)	89.42	77.10	60.1	-29.32

*not available

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

black students were in predominantly white schools. Four other states among the most integrated had largely eliminated their serious problems of segregation with plans covering their largest urban areas where the segregation was concentrated--Oklahoma with a plan in Oklahoma City (since partially abandoned), Rhode Island with a plan in Providence, Colorado with the Denver plan, the Supreme Court's first major order outside the South; and Indiana with the city-suburban desegregation plan in metropolitan Indianapolis.

The only highly integrated states with very large black enrollments are North Carolina and Florida, which rank fifth and sixth in the nation in the number of black students and both of which faced serious desegregation problems in many large school districts. The first large city-suburban desegregation plan in U.S. history was implemented in North Carolina's largest metropolitan area, Charlotte, in 1971 and the area has remained highly integrated. Florida desegregated most of its large metropolitan areas on a city-suburban basis shortly after the Charlotte decision, in the 1971-1972 period. The plans implemented then were so far reaching that they greatly reduced segregation statewide throughout the next fifteen years in spite of the fact that the largest urbanized area, metropolitan Miami, never had a major desegregation plan.

The states with the highest levels of integration are primarily states which once practiced absolute segregation under state laws requiring racial separation. They are a dramatically

different group of states than those listed in Table 3, which shows the most segregated states in the U.S. for black students. The states heading the list in 1984 include two of the old hotbeds of abolitionism, Illinois and Michigan, and a pioneer in modern civil rights law, New York. Each of these three states has a very large number of black students but smaller proportions of blacks in their total enrollments than many southern states: New York has 19%, Michigan, 17%, and Illinois, 25%. They are primarily distinctive in terms of the scale of their segregated residential areas, the fragmentation of school districts within their large metropolitan areas, and the lack of any city-suburban desegregation plan in any of their largest urban communities. New York City, Chicago and Detroit lack either comprehensive plans of any sort within their overwhelmingly minority central city systems or even a voluntary program for exchange of students with suburban school districts with available space. Black students in the schools of the most segregated states have less than a third as many white classmates as those in the most integrated states and far less than the average in the states that once had segregation by law.

The other states on the list of the most segregated tend to be large, highly urbanized states with fragmented school districts--New Jersey, California, Pennsylvania, Missouri, and Maryland. The only state from the Deep South that is included on the lists of most segregated is Mississippi, which is, nontheless, more integrated than most of the largest Northern

TABLE 3

STATES WITH LARGEST BLACK ENROLLMENT AND
HIGHEST LEVELS OF SEGREGATION OF BLACK STUDENTS
ACCORDING TO THREE MEASURES, 1984

Rank	Black Percentage of Total Enrollment	Percentage of Black Students in Predominantly Minority Schools	Percentage of Black Students in 90-100% Minority Schools	Percentage of White Students in School of Typical Black Student*
1	Mississippi (50.4)	Illinois (84.0)	Illinois (69.0)	Illinois (16.5)
2	Louisiana (42.5)	Michigan (83.8)	New York (56.7)	Michigan (19.4)
3	South Carolina (40.6)	New York (81.7)	Michigan (56.3)	New York (20.6)
4	Maryland (37.2)	Maryland (79.2)	New Jersey (48.8)	Maryland (26.6)
5	Georgia (35.8)	California (74.8)	Missouri (44.6)	New Jersey (29.1)
6	Alabama (34.5)	Hawaii (73.7)	Pennsylvania (41.6)	California (29.3)
7	North Carolina (30.0)	Mississippi (72.9)	Mississippi (38.7)	Mississippi (29.9)
8	Delaware (25.8)	New Jersey (70.1)	Maryland (38.3)	Missouri (31.5)
9	Arkansas (25.3)	Missouri (69.5)	Tennessee (36.2)	Pennsylvania (32.6)
10	Illinois (24.8)	Pennsylvania (66.9)	California (35.4)	Georgia (34.2)

*Lowest percentage represents greatest segregation; thus states in this column are ranked in order of increasing percentage. That is, Illinois has the smallest percentage of white students in the school of a typical black.

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

states, although Mississippi has a far higher proportion of black enrollment (50.4%) than any of them.

Most of the states do not show any substantial change in levels of segregation during the 1980s. The data shows that there have been few major changes of desegregation policy either toward greater or lesser segregation during the 1980-84 period. In most portions of the country there have not been the kinds of major changes in the demography of the white or black populations during this period to produce substantial changes in the absence of a new policy. The states where there has been a significant reduction in segregation levels are quite different from those where integration took place during the 1970s. New Jersey and Pennsylvania, for example, both show modest reductions in the level of isolation of blacks in their highly segregated schools since 1980. This may well be the result of state government desegregation policies and the enforcement of those policies by relatively active state agencies. During a period of federal inaction or hostility to urban desegregation, it is not surprising that state initiatives would become more visible. At the same time, the state showing the most substantial increase in segregation since 1980, Maryland, is not a place where desegregation plans have been abandoned. The likely cause is the rapidly spread of black residents and residential segregation in some major parts of the metropolitan area, as black ghettos expand in the suburban rings of Washington and Baltimore without the development of school desegregation plans sufficiently

powerful and wide-reaching to offset the consequences of residential change.

The 1980-1984 trends in desegregation in the Northeast, the most segregated region, show modest progress in increasing integration in Pennsylvania and New Jersey but further increases in separation in the region's most segregated state, New York. All three measures used in this study showed positive changes between 1980 and 1984 for the two states and backward movement for New York, the nation's second most segregated state for black students. In New Jersey the percent of black students attending majority white schools rose from 23% to 29% and the percent white in the school of the typical black student increased by 3%. In Pennsylvania, another highly segregated state, the percent of blacks in intensely segregated schools with 90-100% minority students dropped from 49% to 42%. These small positive changes may be related to the continuing efforts of the state civil rights officials in enforcing the states' unusual school desegregation requirements in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia and other districts.

The trends in New York were more discouraging. The percent of white students in the school of the typical black student declined from 23% to 21% and the other measures also fell. 57% of the state's black students were in intensely segregated schools. The fact that these very high levels of segregation persist in the face of considerable desegregation in Buffalo, Rochester, and other parts of the state reflect the

persisting residential and educational segregation in the New York metropolitan area and the failure to develop any school desegregation plans adequate to offset these patterns.

Most states in the Southern and Border regions, where the substantial majority of blacks live, did not have significant changes in desegregation in the 1980s. (See Table 4) The region as a whole showed virtually no change. There was even a slight increase in integration in one of the measures used in this study. Among the states there were two with an increase in integration during the period. Louisiana became modestly more integrated, probably because of the implementation of a new desegregation plan in the Baton Rouge area. Isolation of black students also declined in Texas, where the Austin desegregation plan was implemented in 1980. Segregation increased most significantly, on the other hand in the states of Georgia and Arkansas. The Georgia data may reflect the trend in the rapidly growing Atlanta area, where the scale of the black community was rapidly expanding and very few whites remained in the central city school district. Little Rock's very rapid growth meant that the city's ghetto expanded to cover more and more of the central city school district and helped lead Little Rock officials to dismantle some desegregation practices in which black students were now being bussed to formerly white schools that had become black. More important, the trends stimulated a partially successful lawsuit to expand the boundaries of the central city district and to move toward metropolitan

TABLE 4

CHANGE IN PERCENTAGE OF BLACK STUDENTS
ATTENDING MAJORITY WHITE SCHOOLS,
BORDER AND SOUTHERN STATES, 1968-84

State	Change in % of State's Black Students in Predominantly White Schools 1968-1984	% of Black Students in Predominantly White Schools 1968	1980	1984
Delaware	39.97	54.23	95.1	94.2
Kentucky	37.38	53.72	91.1	91.1
Alabama	33.01	8.29	44.3	41.3
Florida	32.09	23.21	60.3	55.3
North Carolina	31.19	28.31	64.0	59.5
South Carolina	29.61	14.19	40.1	43.8
Louisiana	24.61	8.89	34.2	33.5
Oklahoma	23.79	37.81	65.7	61.6
Virginia	21.60	26.90	42.3	48.5
Mississippi	20.39	6.71	23.6	27.1
Georgia	19.47	14.03	39.9	33.5
Tennessee	17.75	21.25	36.7	39.0
Texas	16.75	25.25	36.0	42.0
Arkansas	15.89	22.61	42.2	38.5
West Virginia	9.47	82.03	94.5	91.5
Missouri	5.94	24.56	36.4	30.5
Washington, D.C.	- 0 .60	0.90	0.9	0.3
Maryland	-10.31	31.11	32.8	20.8
Total South		*	42.9	43.1
Total Border		*	40.8	37.5

*not available

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

desegregation. The positive effects of that plan occurred after this data was collected.

Within the Midwest the basic patterns of state by state segregation did not change much in the early eighties. The only states with significant black populations to experience a significant increase in integration were Indiana and Kansas. In the case of Indiana there was an obvious impact from the enforcement of a city-suburban integration plan in the state's dominant metropolitan area. In striking contrast, the only state to show a substantial increase in segregation in this period was Michigan, the very place where the Supreme Court had rejected city-suburban integration in its extremely important 1974 Detroit decision, Milliken v. Bradley. In Michigan, the proportion of black students in intensely segregated schools increased from 51% to 56% during this four year period.

The racial pattern did not change much for blacks in the major Western states between 1980 and 1984. The general pattern was one of very slow increase in segregation. There was, however, a more rapid increase in the percent of black children in intensely segregated schools in Arizona during this period. None of the Western states showed any significant increase in integration for black students during this period except for modest improvements in California. The proportion of blacks in intensely segregated schools in California dropped from 41% to 35% and there was a small gain in the proportion of whites in the school of the typical black.

The record in the Midwest was not one of major change. (see appendix). By far the largest increase in integration came in Indiana, where the metropolitan Indianapolis desegregation plan was implemented. In Indianapolis there was a 10% drop in the proportion of blacks in intensely segregated schools and the proportion of whites in the school of the typical black increased from 39% to 49%. Michigan, the state where the Supreme Court rejected city-suburban integration showed a clear increase in the previously high level of segregation. In 1984 only 25% of Indiana black students remained in intensely segregated schools compared to 56% in Michigan and 69% in Illinois, the nation's most segregated state for black students. A number of midwestern states with small black populations including Minnesota, Iowa, and Nebraska reported less than 1% of their black students in such schools. Each of these states had desegregation plans in place in the cities with the largest black enrollments.

The extreme contrasts in the school segregation levels of the Midwest reflect not only the different policies pursued in different states but also the extraordinary concentration of the region's black students in a few large cities. In many cases the statistics for the entire state depend on whether or not a way has been devised to desegregate one or two large urban centers. It is also true that the key to progress there has been overcoming the division between city and suburban school districts. Of all the states in the Midwest, only Indiana made significant progress on that issue so far in the 1980s. There

will be a trial on metropolitan desegregation in the Milwaukee area later this year.

BLACK SEGREGATION AT THE METROPOLITAN LEVEL

Metropolitan areas affect entire states, but there can also be major differences among metropolitan areas within particular states. Looking at a map of the distribution of population in the United States it is clear that the country can be understood best as a collection of a small number of vast urban complexes, scores of smaller metropolitan areas, and vast areas of very little population punctuated by small towns and small cities. America is a metropolitan society and blacks and Hispanics are even more concentrated in large metropolitan areas than are their white counterparts. American life is built around economies and societies organized at the metropolitan level. When one looks at the schools of these metropolitan societies it is apparent that they are evolving in strikingly different ways, even among metropolitan areas whose overall population is quite similar. We have metropolitan areas where there has been no significant segregated education for a generation and others where there is simply no sign that the Supreme Court ever ruled against segregation. At one extreme are large metropolitan areas with an almost all black and all-low income central city student body surrounded by virtually all-white segregated suburban school

systems. At the other extreme, all schools in the inner city have predominantly white middle class majorities and all schools in the outer suburbs are substantially integrated with black children.

The differences between school district plans are strongly related to region of the country, to the degree of fragmentation among school districts in the metropolitan region and to the basic principles of any court order requiring desegregation. All of these conditions tend to produce more thoroughgoing plans for southern districts. Southern districts desegregated earlier, were often under much more far-reaching and comprehensive orders, and tended to include far more of the city and the newer suurban areas within a single large school districts or a few districts than was true in the North and West.

The fragmentation of districts, particularly those in the urban Midwest and Northeast, is so great that it is impossible to even know with any precision how segregated the metropolitan areas are and how they are changing. The federal government has often failed to collect racial data from small suburban districts with virtually all-white student bodies, even though they may, in the aggregate, contain a substantial portion of the metropolitan school population. Although the Census Bureau collects great amounts of data on a metropolitan basis and federal and state economic and other statistics are very often presented at the metropolitan level, the collection of school desegregation data ignores this reality and makes it difficult to assess trends in

the broader urban communities. Since the federal statistics are the only readily available source of racial data, this means that it is often impossible to compute measures of segregation for the more fragmented metropolitan areas. That is the reason that this report, and preceding reports, is able to offer segregation measures for a good many southern districts and a fair number in the West and the Border States, but has weak coverage of the metropolitan areas of the Northeast and Midwest, the very areas with the highest segregation levels. The very reason why the data is so limited--the existence of many small white districts from which the government often fails to collect any data --is also one principal reason why segregation is so high.

The South and the Border states are particularly good areas to study the differences in metropolitan segregation levels because urban desegregation occurred there first on a large scale and the black population is substantial in a great many cities rather then being overwhelmingly concentrated in massive central cities as is true in many Northern states. There is much to compare and there have been very different plans in effect for many years affecting metropolitan areas that are physically near to one another but radically different in the development of the desegregation plan.

Even in the southern and border states the data collected by the federal government does not permit studying segregation in all metropolitan areas, although the school districts tend to be less fragmented. The coverage provided by the federal data

system, however, is much better in these regions and most large metropolitan areas are covered sufficiently to permit calculations of segregation trends.

The most integrated large metropolitan areas in the southern and border states in 1984 had school systems where the typical black student was in a school where more than half the students were white. The following are the most integrated areas in the two regions which once practiced segregation by law:

Table 5

PERCENT OF WHITE STUDENTS IN SCHOOL OF TYPICAL BLACK STUDENT, MOST INTEGRATED AREAS, FALL 1984

Tampa-St. Petersburg, Florida	66.3% whites
Wilmington, Delaware	65.7%
Louisville, Kentucky	65.4%
Greenville, South Carolina	61.1%
Greensboro, North Carolina	57.6%
Orlando, Florida	51.1%

At the other extreme are a group of metropolitan areas that are the most segregated from those on which the government collected sufficient data to calculate this measure of racial contact.

Table 6

PERCENT WHITE IN SCHOOL OF TYPICAL BLACK STUDENT IN MOST SEGREGATED AREAS, FALL 1984

Baltimore, Maryland	15.8%
Miami, Florida	16.1%
Atlanta, Georgia	17.2%
New Orleans, Louisiana	18.0%
Memphis, Tennessee	18.4%
Houston, Texas	19.0%

The list of the most segregated metropolitan areas includes a number of the great cities of southern history, large older cities with substantial black populations. Two of them, Miami and Houston, are also among the nation's most important centers of Hispanic settlement. The metropolitan areas differ in another fundamental way, however. Those on the first list have sweeping city-suburban desegregation plans and have had them for a number of years.

Three of those on the list of the most segregated, Atlanta, Baltimore, and New Orleans never had a major mandatory busing plan. Both Miami and Houston did have modest mandatory plans but they were plans of a very strange character, often forcing integration not between whites and minority students but between black and Hispanic children. In both of those cases, the

judges chose to count Hispanics as whites rather than another racial minority group and thus tended to transport some low income blacks to low income Hispanic schools and vice versa while leaving the white middle class substantially untouched.

The only area on the list of most segregated to have implemented a major mandatory busing order was Memphis. That order was confined to the central city district, but the district did embrace most of the urbanized area. Memphis was the most resistant of the Southern school districts to the busing plan and many of its local leaders were involved in the creation of a vast, largely new, parallel private school system.

By the middle 1980s, the Supreme Court had rejected an effort for city-suburban integration in Atlanta, the Houston school district had been dismissed from court supervision without achieving any significant desegregation, the Memphis school district was operating under a consent agreement using voluntary desegregation strategies, there was no desegregation plan and no litigation in New Orleans or Baltimore, and there were some local efforts to improve the plan in the Miami-Dade area, but the entire county had a large majority of non-white students.

The six most integrated metropolitan areas were under the very kind of large-scale mandatory, inter-district desegregation plans that have been so frequently targeted for special criticism. The four systems within the South had implemented these plans in the early seventies, fifteen years or more ago. The other two came later, Louisville 12 years ago and Wilmington

TABLE 7

INTEGRATION LEVELS FOR BLACK AND HISPANIC STUDENTS
IN LARGEST SURVEYED METROPOLITAN AREAS IN
SOUTHERN AND BORDER STATES, 1980 AND 1984

Metropolitan Area	Percentage of Whites in School Attended by Typical Black Student		Percentage of Whites in School Attended by Typical Hispanic Student	
	1980	1984	1980	1984
Washington, D.C.	24.7	24.3	~	~
Houston, Tex.	20.1	19.0	37.2	29.9
Atlanta, Ga.	22.3	17.2	~	~
Baltimore, Md.	24.3	15.8	~	~
Miami, Fla.	17.9	16.1	24.4	21.0
Tampa, Fla.	72.4	66.3	~	65.9
San Antonio, Tex.	27.0	21.2	20.8	17.0
New Orleans, La.	19.6	18.0	~	~
Memphis, Tenn.	20.8	18.4	~	~
Norfolk, Va.	44.9	45.0	~	~
Birmingham, Ala.	24.1	22.9	~	~
Jacksonville, Fla.	49.7	47.3	~	~
Greensboro, N.C.	60.1	57.6	~	~
Orlando, Fla.	53.6	51.1	~	~
Louisville, Ky.	67.9	65.4	~	~
Nashville, Tenn.	55.9	55.3	~	~
Oklahoma City, Okla.	55.5	50.9	~	~
El Paso, Tex.	*	*	17.3	15.6
Richmond, Va.	28.3	27.1	~	~
Greenville, S.C.	65.3	61.1	~	~
Baton Rouge, La.	29.2	40.7	~	~
Mobile, Ala.	34.9	33.9	~	~
Charleston, S.C.	34.1	36.0	~	~
Wilmington, Del.	67.8	65.7	~	~
Shreveport, La.	30.5	28.8	~	~
West Palm Beach, Fla.	44.3	39.0	55.2	55.9
Austin, Tex.	45.0	41.0	46.1	45.0
Little Rock, Ark.	49.9	42.8	~	~
Columbia, S. C.	34.6	32.8	~	~
Augusta, Ga.	46.3	35.0	~	~
McAllen, Tex.	*	*	7.1	6.2

~Less than 5 percent Hispanic enrollment
*Less than 5 percent black enrollment

Source: U. S. Department of Education Data

TABLE 8

CHANGES IN INTEGRATION LEVELS FOR BLACK AND HISPANIC STUDENTS IN THE LARGEST SURVEYED METROPOLITAN AREAS IN SOUTHERN AND BORDER STATES, 1970-1980 AND 1980-1984

Metropolitan Area	Change in Percentage of Whites in School Attended by Typical Black Student 1970-80	1980-84	Change in Percentage of Whites in School Attended by Typical Hispanic Student 1970-80	1980-84
Washington, D.C.	- 7.6	- .4	~	~
Houston, Tex.	0.9	- 1.1	- 8.4	- 7.3
Atlanta, Ga.	- 0.8	- 5.1	~	~
Baltimore, Md.	5.4	- 8.5	~	~
Miami, Fla.	- 8.1	- 1.8	-14.1	- 3.4
Tampa, Fla.	36.8	- 6.1	~	~
San Antonio, Tex.	4.7	- 5.8	- 0.9	- 3.8
New Orleans, La.	2.4	- 1.6	~	~
Memphis, Tenn.	7.1	- 2.4	~	~
Norfolk, Va.	11.1	0.1	~	~
Birmingham, Ala.	2.6	- 1.2	~	~
Jacksonville, Fla.	19.4	- 2.4	~	~
Greensboro, N.C.	18.6	- 2.5	~	~
Orlando, Fla.	9.3	- 2.5	~	~
Louisville, Ky.	43.0	- 2.5	~	~
Nashville, Tenn.	18.8	- 0.6	~	~
Oklahoma City, Okla.	33.1	- 4.6	~	~
El Paso, Tex.	*	*	- 3.2	- 1.7
Richmond, Va.	- 1.2	- 1.2	~	~
Greenville, S.C.	- 5.1	- 4.2	~	~
Baton Rouge, La.	2.6	11.5	~	~
Mobile, Ala.	5.9	- 1.0	~	~
Charleston, S.C.	4.6	1.9	~	~
Wilmington, Del.	35.5	- 2.1	~	~
Shreveport, La.	4.6	- 1.7	~	~
West Palm Beach, Fla.	11.6	- 5.3	- 7.1	- 0.7
Austin, Tex.	25.4	- 4.0	12.4	- 1.1
Little Rock, Ark.	14.0	- 7.1	~	~
Columbia, S. C.	- 4.9	-1.8	~	~
Augusta, Ga.	9.7	-11.3	~	~
McAllen, Tex.	*	*	- 6.7	- 0.9

~Less than 5 percent Hispanic enrollment
*Less than 5 percent black enrollment

in 1978.

Most of the metropolitan areas included in Tables 7 and 8 did not experience large changes in segregation levels in the 1980s. Between 1980 and 1984 most experienced a small decrease (below 3%) in the proportion of whites in the school of the typical black student. This probably reflected demographic change as central city and inner suburban ghettos expanded and new white suburbs grew without adjustments to the old desegregation plan. Some metropolitan areas, however, experienced a much more rapid decline in integration, as reflected in the following table:

Table 9

LARGEST DECLINES IN METROPOLITAN SCHOOL INTEGRATION FOR BLACKS, 1980-1984

area	% white in school of typical black
Augusta, Georgia	-11.3%
Baltimore, Maryland	- 8.5%
Little Rock	- 7.1%
Tampa-St. Petersburg	- 6.1%
San Antonio	- 5.8%
West Palm Beach	- 5.3%
Atlanta	- 5.1%

There were very few large metropolitan areas that moved in the direction of increased integration in the 1980-84 period in the southern and border states. By far the largest positive

change came in the Baton Rouge, Louisiana, metropolitan area, where the typical black student in 1984 was attending a school with 11.5% more whites than had been true four years earlier. This metropolitan area is dominated by a school district in which the Justice Department fought an unsuccessful battle during these years to replace a mandatory desegregation plan by a voluntary one. The only other large southern metropolitan area to show any significant gain in desegregation during the early 1980s was Charleston, S.C., where there was a slight increase of 1.9%

The other region that has a good number of metropolitan regions with adequate data is the West. (See Table 10). It is somewhat unfair to compare western and southern figures because the western cities tend to have far smaller proportions of black students and because Hispanics are the dominant local minority. Limiting the study to areas with at least 5% blacks eliminated the extreme cases but does not solve the problem.

The most segregated areas for blacks are the two great older cities of California, San Francisco and Los Angeles. The typical Los Angeles black student was in an 84.3% minority school in 1984, slightly above that of his counterpart in San Francisco-Oakland, where the number was 82.5% Both areas became more segregated between 1980 and 1984. The next most segregated Western areas were metro Fresno, Phoenix, and San Diego. At the other extreme, the most integrated areas were Tacoma, Washington, Las Vegas, Nevada, and Colorado Springs, Colorado, areas with small black populations.

TABLE 10

SEGREGATION OF BLACK STUDENTS IN SELECTED WESTERN METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH ENROLLMENTS OVER 50,000 AND MORE THAN 5 PERCENT BLACK, 1970, 1980, 1984

Metropolitan Area	% of Whites in School of Typical Black Student 1970	1980	1984	Percentage Point Change 1970-80	Percentage Point Change 1970-84
Los Angeles	13.7	16.1	15.7	2.4	2.0
San Francisco-Oakland	27.0	23.3	17.5	-3.7	-9.5
Fresno	29.9	35.8	30.3	5.9	.4
Phoenix	29.1	36.3	37.4	7.2	8.3
San Diego	35.7	42.5	39.1	6.8	3.4
Sacramento	60.7	50.0	37.0	-10.7	-23.7
Denver	40.0	50.2	46.8	10.1	6.8
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa	64.7	50.7	38.8	-14.0	-25.9
Seattle	52.3	56.5	52.9	4.2	.6
Riverside	59.2	57.0	49.8	- 2.2	- 9.4
Colorado Springs	63.1	67.9	69.6	4.8	6.5
Las Vegas	53.5	68.0	66.2	14.5	12.7
Tacoma	77.1	71.6	67.8	- 5.5	- 9.3

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

In addition to important demographic differences, the areas at the top and bottom of the Western list have very different kinds of desegregation plans. Los Angeles, which became slightly less segregated from 1970 to 1980, during the period when a partial mandatory desegregation plan was in effect in part of the central city, was under a purely voluntary plan in 1984. San Francisco had a plan limited to the central city with a new consent agreement emphasizing voluntary transfers negotiated in the early 1980s, but San Francisco's enrollment was only about one-sixth white and there was little that could be done without crossing school district lines. The Western cities with the largest minority enrollment under a mandatory court ordered plan were Denver and Seattle, where blacks in the metropolitan areas attended schools with an average white enrollment about three times the Los Angeles and San Francisco levels. The Reagan Justice Department fought in the 1980s to dismantle the mandatory plans in Denver, Seattle, and Los Angeles, taking the last two cases to the Supreme Court. Only in Los Angeles (a city desegregated under state rather than federal law) did the courts permit a return to neighborhood schools, a change that took place in 1981.

The U.S. Department of Education data did not contain sufficient information to calculate the level of segregation of black students in most metropolitan areas in the Northeast and Midwest. There were, however, some important exceptions.

Table 11

PERCENT WHITE IN THE SCHOOL OF THE

TYPICAL BLACK STUDENT, FALL 1984

metro area	percent white
Boston	31.9
Cincinnati	31.5
Chicago	8.6
Cleveland	21.8
Columbus	53.0
Detroit	9.2
Hartford	20.5
Indianapolis	56.2
Kansas City	28.6
Milwaukee	34.5
Minneapolis	63.2
New York City	11.4
Newark	8.7
Philadelphia	16.6
St. Louis	16

1984 count of black students in OCR surveys equals at least 85% of number reported in 1980 Census for metro areas except for Indianapolis (77%), Newark (75%), and St. Louis (75%)

The data shows vast differences in levels of integration among those metropolitan areas in the Northeast and Midwest with the necessary data. The three most segregated, Chicago, Newark, and Detroit have black students who are, on average in schools that are 91% nonwhite. The three most integrated metropolitan areas, Minneapolis, Indianapolis, and Columbus have black students attending schools which have average white enrollments significantly above 50%. Black students in the more integrated areas are in school with more than five times as many white students as in the most segregated area.

Each of the most integrated areas had a long-standing court-ordered desegregation plan. The Minneapolis plan was one of the oldest large city plans in the Midwest. Metropolitan Minneapolis has a small percent of black population and did not face challenges on the scale of those confronting other large urban areas. Indianapolis, on the other hand, is a black majority district where the high level of integration has required both a major mandatory plan within the central city and a mandatory one-way transfer of black students to the suburban school districts. The Columbus plan includes only the central school district but it is comprehensive and the district does include a number of recently developed communities that would have been independent suburbs in a metropolitan area without such a strong tradition of municipal annexation.

The most segregated cities on this list have very different desegregation situations. Chicago is a huge school

district in which more than five of every six students are non-white and in which there is no mandatory desegregation plan and no exchange of students between the city and the suburbs. The city has hundreds of totally segregated minority schools. Newark is an overwhelmingly black school district with no desegregation plan and no city-suburban desegregation. The Detroit metropolitan area was the locus of the decisive 1974 Supreme Court battle over city-suburban desegregation. In its 5-4 decision in Milliken v. Bradley, the Supreme Court rejected the findings of the lower courts that desegregation limited to the central city would be futile and would not last. After the Supreme Court's ruling a desegregation plan concentrating on integration of the remaining white segregated schools within a school district that was already four-fifths black was implemented, together with a special educational program in which the state was ordered to spend funds to upgrade city schools. The great majority of the metropolitan area's black students continue to attend the Detroit schools which have continued to experience declining white enrollment and resegregation.

Between the extremes there are a variety of approaches to desegregation. Metropolitan Milwaukee and Boston report similar levels of integration. Both are under court orders. Boston's central city plan includes considerable mandatory reassignment and a number of magnet programs. Milwaukee has what is perhaps the most extensive magnet program in the U.S. and has avoided a major mandatory order by meeting the court's goals through this

approach. A lawsuit by the Milwaukee school board asking for merger with and desegregation with the suburbs goes to trial this year. Both Boston and Milwaukee have been operating voluntary city-suburban exchanges for years, using funds provided by their state governments. Cincinnati is operating under a consent agreement which is attempting to use voluntary approaches to reached fixed desegregation goals under an agreement to use mandatory procedures if necessary.

Cleveland and Kansas City are operating under mandatory plans which were limited to the central city at the time this data was collected. Kansas City is now under an order to attempt to establish voluntary city-suburban exchanges. St. Louis has a combined mandatory and magnet plan in the central city and was beginning to implement a large city-suburban exchange plan when this data was collected. That plan has grown significantly since 1984. Philadelphia plan is limited to the central city and is voluntary. Some areas in the Philadelphia suburbs with significant black populations are under plans required by the state government. New York City, which is the most segregated of the metropolitan areas in this group, has never had a significant busing or city-suburban plan and its desegregation efforts have been largely limited to localized plans for particular schools.

HISPANIC SEGREGATION TRENDS

The striking contrast between the analysis of black and Hispanic trends is that the black trends seem powerfully related

TABLE 12

STATES WITH LARGEST HISPANIC ENROLLMENT, 1984

State	1984 Enrollment	% of 1984 National Total Hispanic Enrollment	1980 Enrollment	% of 1980 National Total Hispanic Enrollment
California	1,285,907	35.7	1,002,188	31.5
Texas	891,261	24.8	864,300	27.2
New York	362,157	10.1	325,532	10.2
Illinois	133,996	3.7	117,790	3.7
Florida	130,271	3.6	117,562	3.7
New Mexico	119,653	3.3	125,779	4.0
Arizona	111,125	3.1	116,644	*

*not available

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

to legal and policy decisions while the Hispanic trends do not. Changes in black segregation and integration relate to national policy changes in the 1960s and early 1970s and,since that time, to the decisions about particular local plans as well as the practical limitations created by limiting plans to central cities when few whites remained in many central city school districts. The Hispanic segregation levels continue to increase throughout the entire period for which data is available in almost all regions of the U.S. The process looks much more like a pure demographic trend, or the product of long established and deeply rooted social patterns rather than of any new policy decisions.

School segregation has been widely understood as a problem for blacks. There is little public discussion of the fact, however, that black students are now less likely to attend schools with less than half whites than are Hispanics. While the level of black segregation is much lower than it was in 1968, the level of Hispanic segregation is much higher. There has been very little organized effort to reverse this trend.

It is less difficult to discuss the statewide trends in Hispanic segregation because Hispanic students are much more regionally concentrated than blacks.(see table 12). The majority of all Hispanics in the U.S. live in California and Texas. Many of the rest live in a short list of states including New York, Florida, and Illinois. Although this is changing, much of the rest of the country still has very small Hispanic populations and there is not yet sufficient population to justify detailed study.

The Hispanic community embraces two large, quite different, populations, the Mexican Americans and the Puerto Ricans, as well as a number of smaller Hispanic groups, including the Cubans who are dominant in the Florida area and a number of rapidly growing Central American communities. The statistics clearly show that the Puerto Ricans are the most segregated and the most disadvantaged of the major groups, in spite of the fact that they were the only major Hispanic population that were citizens from the outset and attended schools in their place of origin where English was taught.

The most segregated state for Hispanics is New York where the Puerto Rican students are concentrated.(see table 13). Residential segregation among Hispanics is also higher in New York than anywhere else in the country.(Massey,1981). In the fall of 1984, 85% of the Hispanic students in New York State attended predominantly minority schools. 59% of the state's Hispanic students were in intensely segregated schools that were 90-100% minority. This level of segregation was higher than that experienced by black students in all but one of the states (Illinois).

Immediately following New York on the list of most segregated states for Hispanic students (see table 13) were one state with a relatively small proportion but a very large number of Hispanic students, Illinois, and another state that has long been a great center of Hispanic settlement and long ago established itself as the most segregated state in the Southwest,

TABLE 13

STATES WITH LARGEST HISPANIC ENROLLMENT AND HIGHEST LEVELS OF SEGREGATION OF HISPANIC STUDENTS ACCORDING TO THREE MEASURES, 1984

Rank	Hispanic Percentage of Total Enrollment	% of Hispanic Students in Predominantly Minority Schools	% of Hispanic Students in 90-100% Minority Schools	Percentage of White Students in School of Typical Hispanic Student*
1	New Mexico (43.4)	New York (85.1)	New York (59.1)	New York (18.9)
2	California (29.2)	Illinois (79.2)	Illinois (41.2)	Texas (27.6)
3	Texas (27.9)	Texas (77.9)	Texas (40.0)	Illinois (28.0)
4	Arizona (21.5)	New Jersey (75.1)	New Jersey (37.1)	New Jersey (29.5)
5	Colorado (15.7)	New Mexico (74.0)	Connecticut (29.4)	California (32.7)
6	New York (13.6)	California (73.9)	Pennsylvania (29.4)	New Mexico (33.0)
7	New Jersey (8.8)	Florida (68.4)	California (26.8)	Florida (35.2)
8	Florida (8.1)	Connecticut (66.5)	Florida (25.6)	Connecticut (35.9)
9	Illinois (8.0)	Pennsylvania (62.9)	Mississippi (25.2)	Pennsylvania (38.0)
10	Connecticut (6.8)	Arizona (59.3)	Arizona (18.0)	Arizona (40.9)

*Lowest percentage represents greatest segregation; thus states in this column are ranked in order of increasing percentage. That is, Illinois has the smallest percentage of white students in the school of a typical black student.

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

Texas. Illinois has only 8% Hispanic students statewide but Hispanics are overwhelmingly concentrated in the Chicago public schools. The Hispanic enrollment is predominantly Mexican American but Illinois also has the nation's second largest Puerto Rican population. In Illinois, four-fifths of the Hispanic students attend predominantly minority schools and two in five are in intensely segregated schools. Texas has one of the highest percent of Hispanic students in the U.S., 28%, and has 78% of them attending majority nonwhite schools and 40% in intensely segregated schools. Illinois has experienced very sharp increases in the isolation of Hispanic students since 1970, with the percent of whites in the school of the typical Hispanic student dropping 22% Texas, on the other hand, has been highly segregated throughout this period.

The other states near New York where the Hispanic population was also predominantly Puerto Rican also ranked very high on the measures of segregation. Even though New Jersey had only 8% Hispanic students, Connecticut only 7% and Pennsylvania only 2%, each of these states ranked among the nation's ten most segregated for Hispanic students. Three fourths of New Jersey's Hispanic students and nearly two-thirds of those in Connecticut and Pennsylvania attended schools with nonwhite majorities. These patterns were closely related, of course, to the combination of high residential segregation and concentration of students in schools districts with few white students. Nonetheless, it was a remarkable level of isolation for a

TABLE 14

PERCENTAGE OF HISPANIC STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS
MORE THAN 50% WHITE, BY STATE

State	Hispanic Enrollment 1984	%	% of Hispanic Students in Schools More than 50% White, by State 1968	1980	1984	Percentage Point Change 1968-1984
California	1,285,907	29.2	61.0	32.1	26.1	-34.9
Texas	891,261	27.9	27.6	21.8	22.1	- 5.5
New York	362,157	13.6	17.6	17.8	14.9	- 2.7
Illinois	133,996	8.0	52.8	34.7	20.8	-32.0
Florida	130,271	8.1	49.9	30.3	31.6	-18.3
New Mexico	119,653	43.4	26.7	24.7	26.0	- .7
Arizona	111,125	21.5	47.9	37.7	40.7	- 7.2
New Jersey	110,217	8.8	44.0	23.5	24.9	-19.1
Colorado	77,499	15.7	63.3	67.1	53.4	- 9.9
Massachusetts	38,146	5.0	75.1	50.4	57.6	-17.5
Connecticut	37,387	6.8	48.7	36.3	33.5	-15.2
Washington	32,397	4.3	87.9	60.0	75.1	-12.8
Michigan	30,765	1.9	•	•	73.4	
Pennsylvania	30,633	1.6	•	•	37.1	
Indiana	18,436	1.7	•	•	68.1	
Oregon	17,898	3.5	99.4	98.2	96.6	- 2.8
Ohio	17,681	1.1	•	•	76.2	
Kansas	14,984	2.9	92.5	86.0	84.9	- 7.6
Utah	14,523	3.3	88.1	96.9	97.3	+ 9.2
Wisconsin	12,133	1.7	•	•	56.7	
Oklahoma	10,944	2.0	•	•	84.0	
Virginia	10,223	1.1	•	•	72.4	
Nevada	9,979	6.6	99.4	94.1	87.9	-11.5
Maryland	7,312	1.5	•	•	64.3	
Idaho	7,088	3.8	99.5	99.8	99.9	+ .4
Louisiana	6,353	.8	•	•	63.0	
Minnesota	6,343	.9	•	•	95.3	
Nebraska	6,298	2.0	•	•	91.0	
Wyoming	5,992	6.4	78.2	94.9	94.2	+16.0
Rhode Island	5,629	3.8	63.9	69.6	58.0	- 5.9
Missouri	5,386	.8	•	•	77.7	
Iowa	4,553	1.0	•	•	100.0	
Hawaii	3,569	2.1	•	•	6.5	
Georgia	3,423	.4	•	•	73.4	
North Carolina	2,935	.3	•	•	79.6	
Washington, D.C.	2,380	2.9	•	•	3.5	
Delaware	2,090	2.1	•	•	85.1	
Montana	1,639	1.0	•	•	89.0	
Alaska	1,557	1.4	•	•	90.7	
Arkansas	1,390	.3	•	•	85.0	
South Carolina	1,149	.2	•	•	78.7	
Tennessee	1,039	.1	•	•	92.3	

Alabama, North Dakota, New Hampshire, Kentucky, South Dakota, Maine, West Virginia, Mississippi, and Vermont each has less than 1000 Hispanic students.

•not available

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

relatively small minority population in these states.

The other two states to show a high and rapidly increasing segregation of Hispanic students are California and Florida, extremely important areas for Hispanic settlement. California had 36% of all Hispanic students in the country in 1984 and gained more than a quarter million Hispanic students since 1980. California's four-year enrollment gain was larger than the total Hispanic enrollment of any state except Texas and New York. Florida had only one-twenty-fifth of the national Hispanic enrollment but was the decisive state for Cuban students and the South Florida area has a rapidly growing Latin community.

Three-fourths of California's Hispanic students (73.9%) and 68% of those in Florida attend schools where less than half the students are white. Both states had experienced very large increases in the levels of segregation. In California, 61% of the state's Hispanic students had been in majority white schools in 1968, but the number had dropped to 32% by 1984; in Florida the drop was from 50% to 32% In other words, the Hispanic students growing up in the mid-1980s had much less contact with English-speaking whites during their schooling that those who went to school sixteen years earlier. The typical California Hispanic student had 54% whites in his school in 1970 but only 33% by 1984. By 1984, 27% of the students in California and 26% of those in Florida were attending intensely segregated schools where 90-100% of the students were nonwhite. The clear tendency was towards even greater segregation.

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE OF WHITE STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF A TYPICAL HISPANIC STUDENT, BY STATE (IN STATES WITH AT LEAST 5% HISPANIC)

State	1984 Percentage Hispanic Enrollment	Percent of White Students in the School of a Typical Hispanic Student			Percentage Point Change
		1970	1980	1984	1970-1984
New Mexico	43.4	36.9	32.6	33.0	- 3.9
California	29.2	54.4	35.9	32.7	-21.7
Texas	27.9	31.1	27.7	27.6	-3.5
Arizona	21.5	45.5	43.5	40.9	- 4.6
Colorado	15.7	56.8	59.0	55.0	- 1.8
New York	13.6	21.6	20.8	18.9	- 2.7
New Jersey	8.8	38.2	29.6	29.5	- 8.7
Florida	8.1	46.4	35.3	35.2	-11.2
Illinois	8.0	50.0	36.4	28.0	-22.0
Connecticut	6.8	47.8	37.9	35.9	-11.9
Nevada	6.6	83.7	75.3	71.7	-12.0
Wyoming	6.4	75.3	82.8	82.3	+ 7.0
Massachusetts	5.0	*	52.6	54.6	

*not available

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

When reviewing the statistics for blacks it was possible to contrast a relatively short list of states where conditions had become substantially worse since the 1960s with a longer list where substantial progress had occurred. The data on Hispanic students does not permit a similar analysis. In examining the states that had at least 5% Hispanic students enrolled in 1984 (see table 15), the only one where the fraction of students in predominantly white schools had increased since 1968 was Wyoming, a small state with less than 6,000 Hispanic pupils. With the exception of Massachusetts,which experienced a slight positive change, all of the states with 5% of more Hispanic students saw a decline in the proportion of whites in the school of the typical Hispanic child between 1980 and 1984. The trends are so uniform in so many different settings, that it is clear that there is a very strong tendency in American society today for an increasing isolation of Hispanic children and there have been no policies that have been able to reverse that tendency.

Although the tendency is towards greater segregation in almost all states, there are still very different levels of racial isolation. Among the six states with more than 10% Hispanic students in 1984, by far the most integrated was Colorado. The typical Hispanic student in Colorado was in a school with 55% white students. According to this measure there had been almost no (1.8%) decline in integration in Colorado since 1970, while California has had a 22% decline to a level of 33%.

There are, of course, many reasons for the difference, including the overwhelming demographic changes affecting California. It is also important to note, however, that Colorado is the only one of these states where the largest city is under a comprehensive desegregation order. The Denver order, which resulted from a 1973 Supreme Court decision forced integration in Denver and ruled that Hispanics were legally entitled to desegregation remedies.

The statistics on segregation at the metropolitan area can only be analyzed in a broad comparative sense for Hispanics in the Southwest. Statistics for fifteen metropolitan areas, as shown in Table 16 , of more than 50,000 students and at least a tenth Hispanics show a wide range of levels of integration but few areas that approach the level of integration achieved for black students in a number of the metropolitan areas of the South. The most integrated metropolitan areas were not major urban centers. Metropolitan Las Vegas, which has a county-wide school district and city-suburban exchanges, has by far the highest level of integration among the large cities. At the other extreme, the Los Angeles metropolitan area, which includes only the central component of the vast Southern California megalopolis, has by far the most serious segregation. The average Hispanic student in metro Los Angeles is in a school that is only 17% white. In the adjoining suburban metropolitan areas of Orange County and Riverside-San Bernardino Counties, the levels were 31% and 40%, for much smaller Hispanic populations.

TABLE 16

SEGREGATION OF HISPANIC STUDENTS IN SELECTED WESTERN METROPOLITAN AREAS WITH ENROLLMENTS OVER 50,000 AND MORE THAN 10 PERCENT HISPANIC, 1970, 1980, 1984

Metropolitan Area	% of Whites in School of Typical Hispanic Student 1970	1980	1984	Percentage Point Change 1970-80	Percentage Point Change 1970-84
Los Angeles	44.9	21.8	17.4	-23.1	-27.5
Albuquerque	39.2	36.3	38.4	- 2.9	- 0.8
Tucson	38.2	38.3	37.7	0.1	- 0.5
Fresno	49.0	39.3	34.5	- 9.7	-14.5
San Francisco-Oakland	61.5	44.6	26.8	-16.9	-34.7
San Diego	67.4	45.2	36.5	-22.2	-30.9
Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove	72.8	48.7	30.7	-24.1	-42.1
Phoenix	50.8	50.1	43.3	- 0.7	- 7.5
Riverside	63.1	54.5	39.5	- 8.6	-23.6
Denver	55.6	55.8	50.0	0.2	- 5.6
Sacramento	70.0	56.5	41.6	-13.5	-28.4
Modesto	78.5	62.0	*	-16.5	
Vellejo-Fairfield-Napa	78.5	66.8	62.6	-11.7	-15.9
Las Vegas	81.9	70.6	66.1	-11.3	-15.8
Colorado Springs	72.0	71.7	70.8	- 0.3	- 1.2

*not available

Source: U. S. Department of Education data

In each of these area there had been a very rapid increase in the isolation of Hispanic students since 1970. In Orange County (Anaheim-Santa Anna), the typical Hispanic student in one of the nation's richest and most rapidly growing counties was in a 73% white school in 1970 but a 31% white school fourteen years later. The other most dramatic decline in integration for Hispanic students came in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area where the proportion of white students in the school of the typical Hispanic dropped from 62% to 27% in this period. San Diego also experienced a rapid drop, from 67% to 37% during this period.

None of the areas experiencing the most rapid growth in the segregation of Hispanic students had either a metropolitan desegregation plan or a comprehensive plan for the central city, with the exception of Sacramento. Many were, however, in the path of a great demographic groundswell of immigration and the continuing Hispanic baby boom.

There was little evidence of any desegregation plans in the West powerful enough to substantially increase Hispanic integration. Las Vegas, certainly not one of the largest areas, was the only major Western city with a metropolitan desegregation plan. A number of the cities had very limited, voluntary plans even for their central city. One reason was that there had been very few cases filed in the West by Hispanic groups to obtain desegregation. Usually the litigation had been far more concerned with issues such as bilingual programs. The San Jose

order, handed down after this data was collected, was the first major urban case in the West won by Hispanic as opposed to black litigators (although Hispanic attorneys had been actively involved in litigating the educational provisions of the desegregation plans in Denver and elsewhere.)

Outside the Southwest, there are a limited number of metropolitan areas where the enrollment is large enough and the available statistics are sufficient to analyze Hispanic desegregation trends. The following table presents data for the most important of those metropolitan regions.

Table 17

PERCENT OF WHITE STUDENTS IN
SCHOOL OF TYPICAL HISPANIC
Selected Metropolitan Areas

area	1980	1984	change
Houston	37.2	29.9	-7.3
Miami	24.4	21.0	-3.4
San Antonio	20.8	17.0	-3.8
El Paso	17.3	15.6	-1.7
Austin	46.1	41.0	-5.1
Chicago	NA	19.5	NA
New York	NA	12.8	NA

The 1980 OCR survey did not permit estimates for Chicago and New York

The limited metropolitan statistics from non-Western cities show that of those for which change data is available only Houston, in the direct path of Mexican migration, has experienced a substantial change in segregation levels in the early 1980s. If comparable data were available for Chicago, another major destination for the migrant stream, the same pattern might well be apparent there.

Austin, the only city on this list with a large mandatory desegregation plan has by far the highest level of integration for Hispanic students. New York City, where the largest Puerto Rican population is concentrated, has the most segregated schools. Most of the areas listed here tend to have even more severe segregation of Hispanic students than most of the Western urban complexes. It is interesting to note that Miami's Hispanic students, a predominantly Cuban group, often described as much better integrated into American society than their Mexican American and Puerto Rican counterparts, are more segregated in the metropolitan Miami area, than Chicanos are in many of the West's large cities.

Summary of Hispanic Segregation Trends

The situation of Hispanic students in the schools of the nation's states and urban centers can be summarized easily. Segregation is high and increasing. The increase is taking place in all regions but it is particularly dramatic in the areas where the Hispanic population is concentrated and rapidly

increasing. Areas where the Hispanic population is Puerto Rican tend to be highly segregated but segregation is increasing more rapidly in a number of metropolitan complexes where the population is primarily Mexican-American. Desegregation plans, particularly mandatory city-wide plans, do appear to be related to significantly higher levels of integration, but almost none of the centers of Hispanic rather than lack settlement have been subjected to such orders. Almost none have the kinds of metropolitan-wide, city-suburban exchange plans that had such a dramatic impact on the reduction of black segregation where they were implemented.

ASIAN SEGREGATION AND INTEGRATION

There has been very little study to date of the segregation of Asian-American students in the public schools of the various states. Until recently their numbers were so small that the question had little consequence.. The 1965 immigration law reforms, the end of the wars in Southeast Asia, and a variety of political and economic crises in Asian and Pacific nations have brought an unprecedented immigration of Asians and made them by far the most rapidly growing racial group in American public schools. In 1984 there were still only 2.5 percent Asian students in the U.S., but a number of states had higher proportions. 8.1% of California's students were Asian, as were 72.7% of those in Hawaii, 3.0% in Maryland, 3.2% in New York, and 4.7% in

Washington State. The Hawaiian figures cannot be interpreted easily since Hawaiian society is a complex,predominantly Asian, society in which various Asian ancestry groups occupy many dominant positions. It is interesting to look at segregation levels,however, in the other four states with the largest proportion of Asian students.

Table 18

AVERAGE EXPOSURE OF ASIAN STUDENTS TO HISPANICS, BLACKS, WHITES AND OTHER ASIAN STUDENTS

state	Whites	Hispanics	Blacks	Asians
California	44.0	25.0	10.9	19.6
Maryland	60.7	3.9	26.8	8.3
New York	47.7	19.5	15.3	17.5
Washington	74.9	3.6	8.2	11.6

The national statistics show even less segregation and even more exposure to whites than the statistics from the states with the most Asian and Pacific students. Outside of Hawaii, the typical Asian student is in a school where 58% of the students are white and only 13% are Asian. In other words, Asian students, although they are coming in large numbers and often locating in large metropolitan areas are not becoming separated from the educational mainstream. On the contrary, they are typically attending well integrated schools with white majorities. Researchers and policy makers who attribute the remarkable educational success of Asian immigrants to family structure and

cultural values should consider that Asians also have access to educational institutions that are much more effectively connected to the mobility systems of American education than are those attended by blacks or by Hispanic immigrants.

CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The most basic conclusion about school desegregation in the early 1980s is that in spite of a heated and determined attack on desegregation policy by the executive branch, there have been no significant changes in the patterns established for both black and Hispanic desegregation by the early 1970s. The great accomplishments in dismantling much of Southern segregation in the sixties and early 1970s have been preserved and consolidated. Although there have been modest movements either backward or forward in individual states and metropolitan areas, the net effect has not been substantial. It appears that no states or metropolitan areas moved toward much more segregated schools as the consequence of a new court order. This does not mean that successful efforts to dismantle large desegregation orders would not have serious effects. The fact is that during the first Reagan Administration, almost no such plans were approved. The first major decisions permitting resegregation on a large scale took effect in Norfolk and a handful of other cities during President Reagan's second term.

Those states and localities with the highest level of

integration tended to have very broad desegregation orders. Those areas which made further progress since 1980 tended to have either new desegregation orders or plans worked out under requirements of state governments. The Hispanic experience, which shows very few policy initiatives and steadily increasing segregation, reinforces the basic conclusion that desegregation will not occur by accident and that explicit, and often sweeping, plans are necessary to make significant progress.

Desegregated education, where it has been achieved in American education, is largely the gift of the last generation. There has been no leadership sufficient to make significant gains, except in a few states and localities, since the Supreme Court's last major expansion of the law of southern school desegregation in 1971.

There are many reasons to think that the time has now come to seriously examine the accomplishments and the challenges still facing school desegregation in national politics. There is a very broad support for the general ideal of integrated education in American public opinion. More surprising, however, is the fact that there has been a substantial increase in public support for the once bitterly controversial technique of busing during the 1980s and both families now bussed and the nation's young adults now have clear majorities in favor. Research in the 1980s is showing that desegregation may not only be related to some significant gains in achievement for minority students but also to differences in college and job experience, and racial

attitudes as an adult in what will be a far more multiracial society.

There are clear signs, on the other hand, of deepening isolation of children growing up in inner city ghettos and barrios from any contact with mainstream American society. Whatever may be the roots of the "urban underclass" it is certainly true that its children go to schools that are almost totally segregated by race and class and have no viable connection to any paths of mobility in education or employment. It may well be that the children being socialized and educated in these underclass schools are even more comprehensively isolated from mainstream middle class society than were the black children of the South whose problems led to the long battle over segregated education in Dixie.

Desegregation is not impossible. It can be accomplished and it tends to last for a long time even when bitter opponents control the national government. We have enough experience over a long enough period of time to know a great deal about what would have to be done to significantly reduce segregation where it has remained untouched into the mid-1980s. It is time to develop a positive policy to put those lessons into practice.

APPENDIX
SCHOOL DESEGREGATION BY STATE

State	% of Black Students in 90–100% Minority Schools			% of Hispanic Students in 90–100% Minority Schools			% of White Students in School of Typical Black		% of White Students in School of Typical Hispanic	
	1980	1984	% change	1980	1984	% change	1980	1984	1980	1984
Alabama	31.9	34.8	+2.9	1.3	0.8	-0.5	39.7	38.0	77.3	73.9
Alaska	0.1	0	- 0.1	0.6	0.4	-0.2	73.6	74.0	75.8	74.7
Arizona	14.0	23.8	+9.8	12.8	18.0	+5.2	44.2	44.1	43.5	40.9
Arkansas	5.1	11.3	+6.2	0	1.5	+1.5	46.5	44.0	80.4	78.9
California	41.4	35.4	-6.0	22.2	26.8	+4.6	27.7	29.3	35.9	32.7
Colorado	0.5	0	- 0.5	1.6	0.1	-1.5	54.2	53.3	59.0	55.0
Connecticut	32.0	33.0	+1.0	24.9	29.4	+4.5	40.3	40.1	37.9	35.9
Delaware	0.8	0	- 0.8	0	0	0	68.5	68.2	63.4	63.3
District of Columbia	95.9	95.2	- 0.7	23.1	65.3	+42.2	1.5	1.7	17.9	12.8
Florida	17.4	19.4	+2.0	25.2	25.6	+0.4	50.6	48.0	35.3	35.2
Georgia	25.8	31.7	+5.9	2.3	4.1	+1.8	38.3	34.2	68.9	65.2
Hawaii	5.6	7.3	+1.7	11.9	12.2	+0.3	44.5	38.3	26.9	24.5
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0.1	+0.1	86.4	89.6	85.4	84.7
Illinois	67.7	69.0	+1.3	32.3	41.2	+8.9	19.0	16.5	36.4	28.0
Indiana	34.7	24.8	-9.9	24.6	16.8	-7.8	38.7	49.4	52.1	61.7
Iowa	0	0	0	0	0	0	78.7	79.1	88.7	87.1
Kansas	9.9	5.3	-4.6	2.9	0.1	-2.8	59.1	61.7	72.5	76.0
Kentucky	0	0	0	0	0	0	74.3	72.1	87.1	80.2
Louisiana	36.9	30.4	-6.5	4.9	7.6	+2.7	32.8	35.0	60.8	53.2
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0	97.3	96.8	97.5	97.2
Maryland	30.3	38.3	+8.0	0.8	2.5	+1.7	35.4	26.6	67.4	58.0
Massachusets	1.7	1.7	0	4.5	2.1	-2.4	50.4	46.1	52.6	54.6
Michigan	51.0	56.3	+5.3	3.0	3.4	+0.4	22.5	19.4	70.6	70.3
Minnesota	0	0.6	+0.6	0.2	0.1	-0.1	69.9	66.5	84.1	83.9
Mississippi	36.7	38.7	+2.0	6.8	25.2	+18.4	29.2	29.9	56.7	51.0
Missouri	44.2	44.6	+0.4	0.5	1.2	+0.7	34.1	31.5	72.7	75.2
Montana	0.2	0	-0.2	0	1.4	+1.4	90.2	88.2	85.5	86.5
Nebraska	1.9	0	-1.9	0.1	0	-0.1	65.5	64.2	84.0	77.7
Nevada	5.8	3.0	-2.8	0.4	0.2	-0.2	68.4	67.0	75.3	71.7
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	95.5	95.9	95.9	95.5
New Jersey	50.0	48.8	-1.2	34.9	37.1	+2.2	26.4	29.1	29.6	29.5
New Mexico	4.7	5.2	+0.5	17.1	17.5	+0.4	49.6	47.0	32.6	33.0
New York	56.2	56.7	+0.5	56.8	59.1	+2.3	23.0	20.6	20.8	18.9
North Carolina	4.8	6.3	+1.5	0.8	1.0	+0.2	54.0	52.6	66.2	64.2
North Dakota	0	1.4	+1.4	0	0.3	+0.3	89.6	86.4	93.7	91.5
Ohio	14.7	13.3	-1.4	0.9	0.4	-0.5	43.2	41.8	68.8	73.2

State	% of Black Students in 90–100% Minority Schools			% of Hispanic Students in 90–100% Minority Schools			% of White Students in School of Typical Black		% of White Students in School of Typical Hispanic	
	1980	1984	% change	1980	1984	% change	1980	1984	1980	1984
Oklahoma	7.7	7.3	-0.4	1.6	0.1	-1.5	57.6	55.6	71.8	70.5
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	66.6	64.9	83.9	81.8
Pennsylvania	49.0	41.6	-7.4	28.8	29.4	+0.6	29.3	32.6	43.4	38.0
Rhode Island	0	1.3	+1.3	0	5.0	+5.0	65.8	62.8	61.5	59.3
South Carolina	14.3	15.7	+1.4	1.0	3.5	+2.5	42.7	43.0	67.9	64.4
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	89.9	85.2	88.8	88.0
Tennessee	29.8	36.2	+6.4	0.5	1.1	+0.6	38.0	37.1	82.4	80.2
Texas	33.9	31.4	-2.5	39.8	40.0	+0.2	35.2	38.5	27.7	27.6
Utah	0	0.4	+0.4	0	0.4	+0.4	77.9	80.4	82.8	84.0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	98.5	98.0	98.5	98.1
Virginia	4.9	8.4	+3.5	0	0.1	+0.1	47.4	47.6	75.1	64.5
Washington	1.4	0	-1.4	0.1	0	+0.1	66.9	65.6	63.5	67.1
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	0	78.7	79.5	91.8	94.1
Wisconsin	21.2	19.5	-1.7	2.2	2.3	+0.1	44.5	41.9	65.2	56.9
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	77.8	80.4	82.8	82.3